

### REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are now pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "30 to 200 parts by weight of a terpene having a weight average molecular weight Mw of 1000 or less and a softening point of 60 to 120°C" in place of "a total of 30 to 200 parts by weight of a terpene resin (A) and an aromatically modified terpene resin (B) in a ratio of (A) : (B) = 100:0 to 50:50 (weight ratio) having a weight average molecular weight Mw of 1000 or less and a softening point of 60 to 120°C". Basis for this amendment to claim 1 can be found in the results of Examples 1-3 in Table I on page 15 of the specification. In view of this amendment to claim 1, claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 has also been amended to move the placement of the term "(II)" for purposes of clarification. The amendments to the claim 1 do not limit its scope. The amendments to the claims do not introduce any new matter.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent application publication 2002/0033557 to Hashimura in view of WO 92/20538 to Dollinger, JP 200-290629 to Ohtsuka and US Patent 5,532,319 to Asahara. The cited references fail to render obvious the present invention.

As is apparent from the present disclosure and as recited in claim 1 as amended, an important aspect of the present invention resides in the use of the specified terpene resin in an amount of 30 to 200 parts by weight per 100 parts of the thermoplastic elastomer including the epoxy-modified styrene-butadiene-based block copolymer, together with the internal mold release agent and the specified organic peroxide, in the adhesive composition layer (II), for the laminate of the air permeation preventive layer/an adhesive layer.

As a result, as evidenced by Table I, the excellent cylindrical molding workability (++) (please see page 12, line 23 to page 13, line 2 of the specification) can be obtained in Examples 1-3. This property is extremely important when the two-layer tubular shape laminate is molded by an inflation method together with the results of the bending test. On the other hand, the results (+) of Example 4 are not excellent.

The above composition and effects obtained therefrom are completely absent in the cited references.

US Patent application publication 2002/0033557 to Hashimura discloses a method of inflation capable of preventing peeling of an inner layer in a molding process accompanied with inflation and deformation. In particular, Hashimura discloses a method of molding a hollow composite by giving deformation towards an inner surface of at least one composite member so as to cause it to laminate with another composite member, comprising giving the deformation and performing the molding by a pressurizing and heating medium.

According to the Office Action, Hashimura discloses a tire laminate comprising (i) an inner liner formed of a thermoplastic elastomer and (ii) an adhesive composition having a thickness between 1 and 100 microns. As the adhesive composition, Hashimura gives a number of examples and suggests that the adhesive is not particularly limited. In fact, Hashimura explicitly states that the adhesive is not critical. Dollinger was relied upon to show that the thermoplastic elastomers are recognized as being suitable adhesive materials when bonding inner liners to additional rubber layers.

However, as mentioned above, an important aspect of the present invention resides in the use of the specified terpene resin in the adhesive composition layer. This is critical in the present invention as discussed above (see Examples 1-3 of the present application). Hashimura is completely silent about this. Likewise, this is completely absent in Dollinger, Ohtsuka and Asahara.

Hashimura broadly discloses the use of a terpene resin (see paragraph [0040]) as a tackifier. However, Hashimura fails to even remotely suggest the use of the specified terpene resin in combination with the epoxy-modified styrene-butadiene-based block copolymer as recited according to the present invention.

Dollinger fails to overcome the above discussed deficiencies of Hashimura with respect to rendering obvious the present invention. In particular, Dollinger, like Hashimura, does not disclose and does not even remotely suggest the use of the specified terpene resin in combination

with the epoxy-modified styrene-butadiene-based block copolymer as recited according to the present invention.

JP 200-290629 to Ohtsuka fails to overcome the above discussed deficiencies of Hashimura and Dollinger with respect to rendering obvious the present invention. In particular, Ohtsuka, like the other cited references, does not disclose and does not even remotely suggest the use of the specified terpene resin in combination with the epoxy-modified styrene-butadiene-based block copolymer as recited according to the present invention.

Asahara fails to overcome the above discussed deficiencies of the above references with respect to rendering obvious the present invention. Asahara discloses a block copolymer composition containing a block copolymer having the formulae:  $(S-B-I)_n-X$  and  $(S-I-B)_n-X$ . In addition, Asahara broadly teaches the use of terpene resins as tackifiers (see col. 8, lines 41-53). However, Asahara, like the other cited references, does not disclose and does not even remotely suggest the use of the specified terpene resin in combination with the epoxy-modified styrene-butadiene-based block copolymer as recited according to the present invention.

In conjunction with interpreting 35 U.S.C. §103 under *Graham V. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1966) and *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007), the initial burden is on the Examiner to provide some apparent reason or suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor did, i.e. the Examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention, or the Examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. In addition, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

As discussed above, the cited references, even if combined, fail to disclose all of the claim recitations. In particular, the cited art fails to disclose and does not even remotely suggest the use of the specified terpene resin in combination with the epoxy-modified styrene-butadiene-based block copolymer as recited according to the present invention.

The mere fact that cited art may be modified in the manner suggested in the Office Action does not make this modification obvious, unless the cited art suggests the desirability of the modification or impliedly suggests the claimed invention, or the Examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.. No such suggestion appears in the cited art in this matter nor has a convincing line of reasoning convincing line of reasoning been presented in this case. The Examiner's attention is kindly directed to *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, *supra*; *In re Dembiczak et al.* 50 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1999), *In re Gordon*, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984), *In re Laskowski*, 10 USPQ2d 1397 (Fed. Cir. 1989) and *In re Fritch*, 23, USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Furthermore, the cited art lacks the necessary direction or incentive to those of ordinary skill in the art to render a rejection under 35 USC 103 sustainable. The cited art fails to provide the degree of predictability of success of achieving the properties attained by the present invention needed to have a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 sustained. See *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, supra*, *Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc.*, 7 USPQ2d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Mercier*, 187 USPQ 774 (CCPA 1975) and *In re Naylor*, 152 USPQ 106 (CCPA 1966).

Moreover, the properties of the subject matter and improvements which are inherent in the claimed subject matter and disclosed in the specification are to be considered when evaluating the question of obviousness under 35 USC 103. See *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, supra*, *Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.*, 16 USPQ2d 1923 (Fed. Cir. 1990), *In re Antonie*, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977), *In re Estes*, 164 USPQ 519 (CCPA 1970), and *In re Papesch*, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963).

No property can be ignored in determining patentability and comparing the claimed invention to the prior art. Along these lines, see *In re Papesch, supra*, *In re Burt et al*, 148 USPQ 548 (CCPA 1966), *In re Ward*, 141 USPQ 227 (CCPA 1964), and *In re Cescon*, 177 USPQ 264 (CCPA 1973).

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

In the event that the examiner believes that an interview would advance the prosecution of this application in any way the undersigned is available at the phone number noted below.

If any additional fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 21713-00026-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated 5-12-08

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Burton A. Ametilek

Registration No.: 24,852

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1875 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 331-7111

(202) 293-6229 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant